## Remarks

Reconsideration of this Application is respectfully requested.

Upon entry of the foregoing amendment, claims 1-21 are pending in the application, with claims 1, 6, and 15 being the independent claims. Claim 1 is currently amended. These changes are believed to introduce no new matter, and their entry is respectfully requested.

Based on the above amendment and the following remarks, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn.

## Allowable Subject Matter

Applicant acknowledges with appreciation the Examiner's allowance of claims 6-21, as indicated in the Office Action.

## Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-5 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 6,564,250 to Nguyen ("Nguyen"). Applicant respectfully traverses.

Claim 1, as presently amended, recites a system for providing a client with access to remote graphics rendering resources at a server. The server includes:

- a graphics application, at the server, wherein said graphics application receives commands from the client; and
- a remote rendering control system, at the server, that receives graphics instructions from said graphics application, generates modified graphics instructions on the basis of said graphics instructions and client

parameters, and outputs said modified graphics instructions to the remote graphics rendering resources.

Nguyen does not disclose the Applicant's invention as recited in independent claim 1. For example, Nguyen does not disclose "a remote rendering control system" that "generates modified graphics instructions on the basis of ... graphics instructions and client parameters."

The Examiner equates the web browser of Nguyen to the "remote rendering control system" of claim 1. In doing so, the Examiner suggests that the "graphics instructions" of claim 1 are equivalent to web requests received by the web browser of Nguyen. Accordingly, the Examiner holds that the "modified graphics instructions" of claim 1 are equivalent to web requests that have been transformed into proper HTTP requests for transmission to a web server.

Applicant disagrees with the Examiner's characterization of web requests and HTTP requests as types of "graphics instructions." Nevertheless, assuming *arguendo* that web requests and HTTP requests are "graphics instructions" and "modified graphics instructions," respectively, Nguyen nowhere teaches or suggests the imposition of client parameters in generating modified graphics instructions, as recited by amended claim 1. Accordingly, the Examiner's rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is traversed, and Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

Applicant submits that dependent claims 2-5 are not rendered obvious over Nguyen for at least the same reasons as independent claim 1 from which they depend, and further in view of their own respective features. Accordingly, the Examiner's rejection of claims 2-5 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is also traversed, and Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

## **Conclusion**

All of the stated grounds of objection and rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicant believes that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment and Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

STERNE KASSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX P.L.L.C.

Michael V. Messinger Attorney for Applicant

Registration No. 37,575

Date:

1100 New York Avenue, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20005-3934

Sept. 29, 2006

(202) 371-2600

559528\_1.DOC